UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.     | FILING DATE                        | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/684,557          | 10/14/2003                         | Charles S. Taylor    | GUID-005CON6        | 5455             |
|                     | 7590 01/22/200<br>OF ALAN W. CANNO | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| 942 MESA OAK COURT  |                                    |                      | SINGH, SUNIL K      |                  |
| SUNNYVALE, CA 94086 |                                    |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                     |                                    |                      | 3732                |                  |
|                     |                                    |                      |                     |                  |
|                     |                                    |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                     |                                    |                      | 01/22/2009          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Comments   | 10/684,557  | TAYLOR ET AL. |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner  | Art Unit      |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sunil K. Singh  | 3732          |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address<br>Period for Reply  |   |               |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |   |               |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |   |               |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 Au   | aust 2008   |               |  |  |  |  |
|  | action is non-final.  |               |  |  |  |  |
| <i>;</i> —   | <del>/ _</del>  |               |  |  |  |  |
| ·  | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. |               |  |  |  |  |
| oloood irradoordanido with the practice andor E.   | x parte Quayre, 1000 0.2. 11, 10  | 0.0.210.      |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |   |               |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>4) Claim(s) 1,12,13,46,53,58,190-192 and 194-220 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.</li> <li>7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> </ul>  |   |               |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) 1,12,13,46,53,58,190-192 and 194-220 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.  Application Papers   |   |               |  |  |  |  |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner   |   |               |  |  |  |  |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.   |   |               |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |   |               |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | ·             |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.   |   |               |  |  |  |  |
| The dath of declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached office Action of form F 10-152.  |   |               |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |               |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of: <ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> </ol> </li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>   |   |               |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  |   |               |  |  |  |  |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  1 Interview Summary (PTO-413)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5 Other:   |   |               |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/684,557 Page 2

Art Unit: 3732

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1,12,13,46,53,58,190-192,194-211,214-20, drawn to a device for use in cardiovascular surgery, classified in class 600 subclass 37.
- II. Claims 212-213 drawn to method of preparing a device, classified in class600, subclass 204.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the process can be used by a materially different product since the process does not require all of the specifics of the product as claimed.
- 3. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:
  - (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

Application/Control Number: 10/684,557 Page 3

Art Unit: 3732

(b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

Art Unit: 3732

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species (a) Fig. 2; (b) Fig. 3; (c) Figs. 4a-4c; (d) Fig. 5; (e) 6a; (f) 6b; (g) Fig. 7a; (h) Fig. 7b; (i) Fig. 7C; (j) Fig. 7d (k) Fig. 7e; (l) Fig. 8; (m) Fig. 9a (n) Fig. 9b (o) Fig. 9H; (p) Fig. 10a; (q) Fig. 10b (r) Fig. 10c; (s)Figs, 15a-15b; (t)Figs. 17a-17D; (u) Figs. 18a-18d; (v) Figs. 19a-19b; (w) Figs. 20a-20e; (x) Figs. 21a-21c (y) Figs. 22a-22c; (a2) Figs. 23a-23b; (b2) Figs. 24a-24b; (c2) Figs. 26a-26c. The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of

search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the

prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

- 5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 6. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

  Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

  All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product

Application/Control Number: 10/684,557

Page 7

Art Unit: 3732

claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sunil K. Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3460. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (Increased Flex Schedule).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris L. Rodriguez can be reached on (571) 272-4964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/684,557 Page 8

Art Unit: 3732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

01/16/2009

/Sunil K Singh/ Examiner, Art Unit 3732

/Ralph A. Lewis/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3732